

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in light of the amendments and remarks herein.

Upon entry of this amendment, claims 1-7 and 9-18 will be pending. As shown below, claims 1, 5-7, 10, and 12-15 have been amended, and new claims 16-18 have been added.

§102 Rejection of Claims 1-6 and 9-15

In Section 1 of the Office Action, the examiner has rejected claims 1-6 and 9-15 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being unpatentable over Iwamura (U.S. Patent 5,883,621; hereinafter referred to as “Iwamura”). This rejection is respectfully traversed below.

Regarding claim 1, as shown above, claim 1 has been amended and calls for:

1. An information signal transmission system comprising:
 - a first device and a second device connected in a network for providing a predetermined information signal through the first and second devices; and
 - recipient detecting means for detecting a recipient of the information signal and generating identification information identifying the detected recipient;
 - wherein the system continuously provides the information signal to the recipient by switching from providing the information signal to the recipient through the first device to providing the information signal to the recipient through the second device using the identification information, and
 - in switching from providing the information signal by the first device to providing the information signal by the second device, the information signal is provided by both the first and second devices for a predetermined duration of time and after the predetermined duration of time has ended the information signal is provided by the second device and is not provided by the first device.

Accordingly, in one aspect of claim 1, the information signal transmission system detects a recipient of the information signal and associates identification information with the detected recipient. The system continuously provides the information signal to the recipient by switching from providing the information signal through the first device to providing the information signal through the second device. The system uses the identification information in making the switch. When the system makes the switch, for a predetermined duration of time the information signal is provided to the recipient by both the first device and the second device. When this predetermined duration of time has ended, the first device no longer provides the information signal. Therefore, the information signal is initially provided to the recipient through the first device, then through the first device and the second device, and then through the second device. In this way, the system continuously provides the information signal to the recipient while switching from the first device to the second device.

Considering the examiner's rejection of claim 1 in Section 1 of the Office Action as applied to amended claim 1, it does not appear that the arguments presented by the examiner in rejecting claim 1 over Iwamura in Section 1 of the Office Action establish how Iwamura shows or suggests amended claim 1. In Section 1, the examiner refers to Figures 1 and 3, and column 8 at lines 18-42 of Iwamura in rejecting claim 1. The examiner appears to argue that the referenced portions of Iwamura show continuously supplying the information signal to the recipient, stating: "Once initialization is over, all the nodes talk to each other so to maintain connectivity". However, in amended claim 1, the system continuously provides the information signal to the recipient by switching from providing information signal through the first device to providing information signal through the second device using the identification information. Therefore, the recipient receives an information signal first through the first device and then

through the second device, so the recipient continuously receives the information signal. The examiner appears to be arguing that because the nodes talk to each other to maintain connectivity, the nodes continuously provide information to one another. Even assuming that Iwamura shows this node communication, merely communicating between nodes is not the same as continuously providing an information signal first from one device and then from another device. Without further explanation by the examiner, it does not appear that the examiner has established how Iwamura shows this aspect of amended claim 1.

The examiner also appears to argue that the drag and drop example discussed at column 8 lines 18-42 of Iwamura shows providing the information signal through both the first device and the second device for a predetermined period of time when switching between the devices, as called for in claim 1. In amended claim 1, when switching from providing the information signal by the first device to providing information signal by the second device, the recipient remains the same. However, it appears that the example referenced by the examiner describes providing a signal from a DVD player to a first VCR (DVCR1) and providing a second signal from a second VCR (DVCR2) to a satellite receiver (DSS IRD). This example appears to show communication within two unrelated pairs of devices. It does not appear that this example describes providing an information signal from a first device to a recipient, then from the first device and a second device to that same recipient, and then from the second device to that same recipient, as called for in amended claim 1 when switching from the first device to the second device. Without further explanation by the examiner, it does not appear that the examiner has established how Iwamura shows or suggests this aspect of amended claim 1.

Accordingly, it does not appear that the examiner has established how Iwamura, as referenced by the examiner in rejecting claim 1, shows or suggests at least these aspects of

amended claim 1, and so it is submitted that the examiner has not established how Iwamura shows or suggests amended claim 1 as a whole. Claims 2-7, 9-12, and 16-18 depend from claim 1, and it is also submitted that the examiner has not established how Iwamura shows or suggests claims 2-7, 9-12, and 16-18, through their dependence on claim 1.

Regarding claim 12, as shown above, claim 12 has been amended and calls for:

12. An information signal transmission system according to Claim 1, further comprising a remote control device, wherein the remote control device adds to a remote control signal an identification code identifying the recipient of the information signal and the remote control device transmits by a wireless transmission the remote control signal.

Accordingly, in one aspect of claim 12, the remote control device sends the remote-control signal by a wireless transmission and the remote control signal includes an identification code.

In rejecting claim 12 in Section 1, the examiner refers to the example discussed in the Iwamura at column 8, lines 18-42. However, it does not appear that this example addresses a wireless transmission of a control signal including an identification code identifying a recipient, as called for in amended claim 12. Therefore, for this reason as well, it does not appear that the examiner has established how Iwamura shows or suggests amended claim 12.

Regarding claim 13, as shown above, claim 13 has been amended and calls for:

13. An information providing device for providing a predetermined information signal supplied through a network by an information reproducing device, the information providing device comprising:
 recipient detecting means for detecting a recipient of the information signal; and
 control means for reporting, after the recipient physically moves, to the information reproducing device through the network, control information for continuously providing the recipient detected by the recipient detecting means with the information

signal that has been provided to the recipient by another information providing device;

wherein the recipient detecting means determines that the recipient has physically moved.

Accordingly, in one aspect of claim 13, the recipient detecting means determines that the recipient has physically moved and the control means reports control information after the recipient physically moves.

In rejecting claim 13 in Section 1, it does not appear that the examiner has explained how Iwamura shows or suggests determining that the recipient has physically moved or reporting control information after the recipient has physically moved, as called for in amended claim 13. Without further explanation by the examiner, is submitted that the examiner has not established how Iwamura shows or suggests this aspect of claim 13.

Accordingly, it does not appear that the examiner has established how Iwamura, as referenced by the examiner in rejecting claim 13, shows or suggests at least these aspects of amended claim 13, and so it is submitted that the examiner has not established how Iwamura shows or suggests amended claim 13 as a whole. Similar arguments apply to claims 14 and 15.

Based upon the foregoing, it is submitted that claims 1-6 and 9-15 are not anticipated by nor rendered obvious by the teachings of Iwamura, as presented and referenced by the examiner. Accordingly, it is submitted that the examiner's rejection of claims 1-6 and 9-15 based upon 35 U.S.C. §102(e) has been overcome by the present remarks and withdrawal thereof is respectfully requested.

§103 Rejection of Claims 7

In Section 2 of the office action, the examiner has rejected claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Iwamura in view of Kimura (U.S. Patent 5,226,090; hereinafter referred to as “Kimura”). This rejection is respectfully traversed below.

Claim 7 depends from claim 1. As discussed above, it is submitted that the rejection to claim 1 has been overcome. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection to claim 7 has also been overcome through the dependence of claim 7 on claim 1.

Based upon the foregoing, it is submitted that claim 7 is not anticipated by nor rendered obvious by the teachings of Iwamura and Kimura, as presented and referenced by the examiner. Accordingly, it is submitted that the examiner’s rejection of claim 7 based upon 35 U.S.C. §103(a) has been overcome by the present remarks and withdrawal thereof is respectfully requested.

New Claims

New claims 16-18 depend from claim 1. As discussed above, it is submitted that the rejection to claim 1 has been overcome.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, entry of this amendment, and the allowance of this application with claims 1-7 and 9-18 is respectfully solicited.

In regard to the claims amended herein and throughout the prosecution of this application, it is submitted that these claims, as originally presented, are patentably distinct over the prior art of record, and that these claims were in full compliance with the requirements of 35

PATENT
Appl. No. 08/977,591
Attorney Docket No. 450100-4193

U.S.C. §112. Changes to these claims, as presented herein, are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §§101, 102, 103 or 112. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which applicants are entitled.

In the event that additional cooperation in this case may be helpful to complete its prosecution, the examiner is cordially invited to contact applicants' representative at the telephone number written below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any insufficient fees or credit any overpayment associated with the above-identified application to Deposit Account 50-0320.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP

By: 
Hans R. Mahr, Reg. No. 46,138 for
William S. Frommer
Reg. No. 25,506
(212) 588-0800